DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 183 300 RC 011 682

AUTHOR Lopez, Hector L.
TITLE Border Community College Consortium Tests: Standardize Tests Developed for Mexican-American Students.
PUB DATE 7 Jun 78
NOTE 43p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Biculturalism; Bilingualism; Bilingual Students; *College Freshmen; *Diagnostic Tests; English (Second Language); Measurement Instruments; *Mexican Americans; Minority Groups; National Competency Tests; Spanish Speaking; Staff Improvement; *Standardized Tests; *Student Placement; *Test Construction; Test Reliability
IDENTIFIERS Border Community College Consortium; Descriptive Test of English Skills; United States (Southwest); Verbal Aptitude Test

ABSTRACT

Because existing standardized college examination tests did not accurately measure the potential for learning of bilingual/bicultural populations, the Border Community College Consortium began in 1971 to develop two standardized tests to address the strengths and weaknesses of Mexican American students in writing, reading, and listening to the English used in college classes. Specifically written for Southwestern freshmen Mexican American students with a Spanish speaking background, the tests were (1) the Descriptive Test of English Skills (DTES), designed as both a diagnostic and a placement tool, and (2) the Verbal Aptitude Test, concerned with examining the students' language strengths in English, Spanish, and a bilingual mode. Results of sample testing of 804 students in 5 of the 6 Consortium colleges indicated that those who took the test appeared to have a better achievement record, a higher grade point average, a higher English class average, and a better persistence record. Although formal studies are needed to assess the diagnostic utility and placement efficiency of the DTES, test results indicate there are good possibilities for successful placement of Mexican American students in English courses. Formal studies are also needed to assess the interrelationship of the three segments of the Verbal Aptitude Test. (SB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED183300

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to:
RC | TM
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.
JC

BORDER COMMUNITY COLLEGE CONSORTIUM TESTS: STANDARDIZE TESTS DEVELOPED FOR MEXICAN-AMERICAN STUDENTS

NOV 1979
ERIC/CRESS
RECEIVED

BY:
HECTOR L. LOPEZ
DEAN OF COUNSELING SERVICES
IMPERIAL VALLEY COLLEGE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Hector L. Lopez
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

JUNE 7, 1978

RC011682

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	PHILOSOPHICAL ARGUMENTS FOR STANDARDIZED TESTS FOR MEXICAN-AMERICAN STUDENTS	1
III.	HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE BORDER COMMUNITY COLLEGE CONSORTIUM TESTS	4
IV.	DESCRIPTION OF THE BORDER COMMUNITY COLLEGE CONSORTIUM TESTS	9
V.	NORMS AND STATISTICAL CHARACTERISTICS	11
VI.	UTILIZATION OF THE BORDER COMMUNITY COLLEGE CONSORTIUM TESTS	16
VII.	CONCLUSION	17
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	20
	APPENDIX	

I. INTRODUCTION

Studies show that 40% of the almost 2 million Mexican-Americans now in public schools will become dropouts, most of them teenagers with no skills and only marginal abilities in the three R's, branded failures at something that society values highly (Frank O. Sotomayor, Los Angeles Times, May 4, 1975, Part VIII, p.3).

II. PHILOSOPHICAL ARGUMENTS FOR STANDARDIZED TESTS FOR MEXICAN-AMERICAN STUDENTS

A problem of major concern to the Border Community College Consortium is the high attrition rate for Mexican-American students, primarily due to the scholastic difficulties and resulting discouragements which they usually experience. Several academic deficiencies are known to contribute to this high attrition rate, especially in the areas of reading abilities, writing skills, study methods and academic attitudes. Most of these deficiencies are thought to be directly attributable to a low level of academic preparation and motivation stemming from the educational disadvantages and/or cultural devaluations typically experienced by most Mexican-Americans living in the border area (3: 3-5).

In an effort to reduce the attrition rate, member institutions have developed compensatory education and tutorial assistance programs designed to correct identified learning disabilities, primarily those in the communication skills area. Thus, accurate diagnosis of learning disabilities and appropriate placement for compensatory instruction and/or tutoring are the all-important first steps in the effort to improve the Mexican-American student's potentiality for academic success. Unfortunately, the existing standardized tests for assessing scholastic ability and/or achieve-

ment have proven to have little or no validity for measuring the current learning potential or predicting the future academic attainment of Mexican-American students (3:2-19).

In addition, many colleges and universities are now cognizant of factors other than grades, i.e., unequal educational opportunities, and a language other than English used in the students' homes, but there still exists the barrier posed by the minority students' belief that a low score received on a college entrance examination means that they do not have a chance to succeed in college. By the same token some minority educators, among others, are also concerned with the implications of short-term prediction because they have observed students, especially minority students, who start a college education making less than average grades but who then continue lessening the gap in achievement as they progress further into college.

It is of further importance to determine if indeed the issue of the test bias is as crucial now as it was in the 1960's. The arguments raised then, opposing the admission of low-ranking students to college and universities, may seem to be less pertinent in the face of the advent of open admission practices. However, such arguments must still be considered in the light of the increasing number of minority students aspiring to obtain professional degrees. To those students the use of standardized test scores remain a crucial matter.

Specifically, the objections to current standardized college examination tests for use with bilingual/bicultural populations were that they did not adequately measure their potential for learning. These deficiencies are clearly reflected in test scores obtained from various standardized tests in English reading and writing. These scores tend to be grouped at the lower end of the scale and as such do not discriminate among students' abilities and potential for academic success. It is a well known statistical principle that when the spread of scores on a test is small, the reliability of the test is also low. Thus, when the typical standardized English tests are administered to Mexican-American students, the results are unrealiable and of limited usefulness. However, low score of Mexican-

American students on standardized tests have often been erroneously interpreted as indicating low potential for academic success with the result of denying equitable educational opportunity to many otherwise capable students (4: 1).

Although five of the six consortium colleges participated in the American College Testing Program, all have expressed dissatisfaction with the test as an appropriate instrument for measuring the academic potential of Mexican-American students. Because of their bilingual/bicultural background, the Mexican-Americans' experience and values are inappropriate to much of the test content. These students score well below the national average on all four subtests - English, Mathematics, Social Studies, and Natural Sciences - because the test questions tend to be geared to the beliefs and experiences of the majority Anglo-American culture rather than to the minority Mexican-American culture. Furthermore, placements and predictions based on ACT test scores are often erroneous because of the low correlation obtained between test results and college grades (5: 2-11).

The data summarized in tables 1, 2, and 3 provided ample proof that the American College Testing Program is doing a less than adequate job in assessing the current learning potential and/or future educational attainment of Mexican-American students at the Border Community Colleges.

As can be seen from the data in Table I, the correlation between ACT composite scores and college grade-point averages is low (.30 in every instance). Furthermore, the correlation between college grades and scores on the English subtest average even lower. From these data, it is evident that the ACT scores are likely to be poor predictors of freshman-year academic achievement by Mexican-American students (6: 19; 7: 18; 8: 14).

The data reported in Table 2 indicate that the ACT scores earned by freshmen enrolled at Laredo Junior College and Texas Southwest College are significantly lower than those made by a natural sample of students beginning college in the academic year of 1971-72. Since the Mexican-

American enrollment at the Laredo and Brownsville campuses was 86.1 percent and 69.9 percent, respectively, it is evident that the American College Testing Program does penalize such students to the extent that their ACT composite scores average in the bottom 10 percent nationally (9: 4 and 10: 4).

The ACT scores earned by national samples of Mexican-Americans and by Caucasian students are compared in Table 3. The scores for the latter group are significantly higher in every instance (3: 179-180).

III. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE BORDER COMMUNITY COLLEGE CONSORTIUM TESTS

The Border Community College Consortium was officially formed in May of 1970 in answer to concerns expressed by faculty and administrators of the six member community colleges regarding Mexican-American educational problems. These community colleges are located along the border areas of Texas, Arizona, and California. Members of the Consortium are:

1. Texas Southwest Community College, Brownsville, Texas.
2. Laredo Junior College, Laredo, Texas.
3. Cochise Community College, Douglas, Arizona.
4. Arizona Western College, Yuma, Arizona.
5. Imperial Valley Community College, Imperial, California.
6. Southwestern Community College, Chula Vista, California.

Among the salient problems which educators in the six community college cited were:

1. Difficulty experienced by students in managing college-level courses.
2. High drop-out rates.
3. Limited courses designed to help students overcome academic deficiencies.

4. The small number of Mexican-American teachers and counselors who were available at the colleges to help students with academic and personal problems
5. The lack of standardized tests for determining English language proficiency for Mexican-Americans.
6. The lack of standardized tests for predicting potential academic achievement for bilingual populations.

A proposal was written and submitted to HEW-Office of Education in June of 1970, in which was discussed the inappropriateness of standardized college entrance examinations tests for use with bilingual/bicultural populations. As previously stated, the objections to these tests were that English language aptitude test results, when administered to most Mexican-American students, did not adequately measure their potential for learning. This statement was supported by citing actual test scores, made by most Mexican-American students on standardized college entrance examinations in the Border Community College Consortium - showing low average scores with minimal score dispersion about the mean. The difficulty, however, was not the low scores but rather the surprising finding by the faculty at the colleges that these same students' academic records indicated that their performance was not uniformly low in their courses of study. That was quite a dispersion around the mean of the earned grades of students, with some earning much higher grades than expected from those indicated by the entering test scores on standardized admission tests.

Program Description. Dissatisfied with the predictive effectiveness and counseling usefulness of existing standardized ability and achievement tests, the Border Community College Consortium decided to explore the possibility of building a new test specifically designed to meet the diagnostic and placement needs of member institutions and to reflect the unique educational and cultural experiences of their Mexican-American students. Accordingly, a one-day workshop was held at Douglas, Arizona, on May 18, 1971, to discuss the possibility of undertaking a test construction effort designed to produce a better testing instrument for assessing the learning potential of Mexican-American students.

Many of the college counselors attending the May 18, 1971, planning conference suggested a different approach to measuring learning potential. They felt that scholastic motivation might be an even more powerful predictor than academic ability in assessing the future success or failure of Mexican-American students. From their own personal experience they had concluded that the student's level of motivation as reflected by positive or negative attitudes toward academic activities and objectives was a key variable determining whether he would, or would not, make the necessary corrections and compensations to assure success in academic endeavors (3: 8).

The favorably response generated at this workshop led to the scheduling of a second workshop at Tempe, Arizona, on July 8-9, 1971. After the problem had been thoroughly aired, it was decided to move ahead with the project and, as a result, a grant request was prepared and submitted to the U.S. Office of Education for funding under provisions of the Education Professions Development Act of 1967. Since representatives of Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, had participated in both workshops, this group was selected as the contract agency to provide technical expertise in the test development effort (5: 1-2).

As originally submitted, the grant request called for the Educational Testing Service to develop English-language placement tests, bilingual tests of verbal skills, and other students assessment and guidance materials; all directed toward the Mexican-American students in the border area. The U.S. Office of Education was asked to contract directly with Educational Testing Service to do the developmental work for the Consortium because the member institutions did not, themselves, have personnel who were well trained in the test construction and research techniques necessary for producing the desired testing and guidance materials. Later, however, the proposal was rewritten because the U.S. Office of Education was not in a position to contract directly with Educational Testing Service to produce the required materials. Instead, the revised contract called for Educational Testing Service to direct a series of

training seminars designed to instruct selected Consortium personnel in test development and educational research methodology so that two outcomes would be achieved: (1) the development of suitable instruments for predicting the academic performance of Mexican American-students at border colleges, and (2) the development of measurement and evaluation skills by key staff members employed at member institutions of the Consortium (8: 9-11).

Once the grant was approved, (financed in part by a grant from EPDA, Title V-E and a grant from Title III, Division of College Support) a series of three, five-day training seminars were scheduled. The first was held May 1-4, 1972, in Douglas, Arizona, and the following four-step agenda were carried out: (1) define the problem in evaluating the potential of college-age Mexican-American students in the border area, (2) develop specifications for experimental instruments and/or techniques for accomplishing the desired evaluation, (3) provide training for Consortium staff members in the development of requisite instruments and/or techniques, and (4) assign responsibility for the development, by teams of Consortium staff members, or potentially useful instruments and/or techniques as specified.

Two additional five-day workshops were scheduled, one to begin July 31, 1972, in San Diego, California, and the other to begin November 13, 1972, in Brownsville, Texas. During the three months between the first and second meetings, the Consortium staff members were to prepare appropriate testing materials and forward them to the contracting agency for critical review. Three weeks prior to the second scheduled workshop, however, it became apparent that the entire project was in jeopardy because the contracting agency had "received only a few test items... and none of the test items received were usable" (129:3). Accordingly, the scheduled five-day workshop was postponed and a one-day planning conference was held on July 31, 1972, in San Diego, California, in order to review the underlying philosophy and working strategy for the test development project. The planning conference participants attempted to formulate revised agenda for the postponed workshop (11:24).

The revised agenda called for a series of four, five-day workshops during which Consortium personnel, supervised by test development specialists from Educational Testing Service, would develop two testing instruments--a written verbal aptitude test with sections in English, Spanish, and combination of the two languages; and, an aural/oral bilingual test for assessing level of verbal fluency in both languages.

After two postponements, the first five-day workshop was held on March 20-24, 1973, in San Deigo, California. Although the project was still alive, the results obtained were not promising, in that, at best, only a bare beginning had been made in developing the two proposed testing instruments. The present status of the project was perhaps best stated in the following excerpt from a memorandum prepared by Dr. George A. Schlekart of Educational Testing Service immediately prior to the March 20-24, 1973, workshop:

> As mentioned earlier, only a fraction of the work can be completed with available funding; for 1972 and 1973 the sum of $40,000 annually was made available for development of all of these projects, whereas the required investment should be approximately $500,000 over a two-year period. At the present rate of movement, the bilingual aptitude test cannot be developed to full usefulness for two or three years, the descriptive test of English will be assembled but no sound scoring or test interpretation systems can be developed (11:6).

Testing materials developed at this workshop were to be further refined at subsequent workshops and rudimentary versions of the two testing instruments were to be field tested in September, 1973, using samples of beginning freshmen at all six campuses (12:6-7).

The final test form was compiled with the items replacing those items found to be ineffective by the item analyses performed. Deltas of the new items were determined to be of appropriate level of difficulty when assembled with the other items of the test. This final phase was completed in Brownsville, Texas, in the spring of 1974.

It was recommended that a thorough norming and validity study be conducted with the final form administration data. In addition, it was hoped that statistical analysis of this administration should also produce deltas, reliable biserrial correlations, and standard errors of the

measure as well as providing statistical analysis of the ralationship and use of the measure in relation to local criteria for usage in relation to prediction, to placement, and to achievement.

Imperial Valley Community College assumed the leadership in 1975 and began preparation for the norming and validity study to take place during the first weeks of the 1976 fall semester. By this time the Border Community College Consortium was not receiving technical assistance from the Educational Testing Services. The research specialist, Dr. Demetrius Karanthanos from Imperial Valley College, began the preparations to conduct the norming and validity study for the entire Consortium.

IV. DESCRIPTION OF THE BORDER COMMUNITY COLLEGE CONSORTIUM TESTS

Over the period from 1972 through 1975 two tests were developed specifically for the Mexican-Americans by a group of students and educators representing six community colleges along the border known as the Border Community College Consortium and testing specialists from the Educational Testing Service (ETS). The two tests developed were:

1) The Descriptive Test of English Skills
2) The Verbal Aptitude Test

Rational for the Descriptive Test of English Skills

Open admission policies at all of the Border Community College Consortium presented the colleges with interrelated problems:

1) Teaching staff had to bring all Mexican-American students to a level of English proficiency that would enable them to compete on a par with other students in all English-taught curriculum, taking into consideration the different level of each student's English proficiency, and

2) Teaching staff were faced with the problems of having to develop instructional programs to fit the different levels of English language proficiency of students enrolled within the same courses of study.

The Descriptive Test of English Skills

The Descriptive Test of English Skills was designed to differentiate discrete problems encountered by students in the English language area that would then help Consortium faculty English teachers determine the areas of study most needed by students. This test essentially was designed as an instrument to facilitate placement in English courses at various levels and as a curriculum aid.

Workshops were conducted in test development theory during three academic years which resulted in the assembly of a pretest form and a final test form that describe English mastery in four areas: vocabulary; writing ability (including grammar mastery, syntax, and idiom); and, listening and reading comprehension.

Rational for the Verbal Aptitude Test

Faculty and administrators at the six Border Consortium Colleges stated that most Mexican-American students enrolled in their colleges live within three language domains:

1) English
2) Spanish
3) Bilingual Mode

The Bilingual Mode is described as being a regional language (basically the same all across the border, but possessing different idiomatic expressions and different linguistic differences according to region) that is essentially a mixture of Spanish and English. The Mexican-American student population across the United States-Mexico border is heterogeneous and differences in language dominance patterns exist among students in the border colleges.

The Verbal Aptitude Test

The Verbal Aptitude Test concerns itself with the examination of the language strengths of Mexican-American students in English, Spanish, and a bilingual mode (a conversational mixture of the English and Spanish in common use along the border).

Score results from the pre-test administration (fall 1973) indicated that the tests could assist Consortium faculty in identifying those students with high fluency in one language but not the other. Correlations among the three scores were relatively low, indicating that each section of the test is measuring a relatively independent ability. Information of a student's relative language strengths is judged to be essential by Consortium faculty in the planning of parallel instructional objectives and in assessing the educational needs of students.

The two tests identify discrete language problem areas in reading, hearing, and using English as well as verbal strengths in Spanish and in a bilingual mode. Both tests have listening and reading comprehension sections.

The final test form was compiled with the items replacing those items found to be ineffective by the item analysis performed. Deltas of the new items were determined to be of appropriate level of difficulty when assembled with the other items of the test.

A diagram showing the contents of the Descriptive Test of English Skills and of the Verbal Aptitude Test is given on Table 4. Part A and B of Section III overlap both of these tests. Both tests may be administered at one time (3½ hrs. testing time). If administered separately the Descriptive Test of English Skills would take one hour and 40 minutes, and two hours and 50 minutes for the Verbal Aptitude Test. The overlapping of parts A and B of Section III results in reducing the total administration time by one hour.

V. NORMS AND STATISTICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TWO TESTS

The norming and validity study was conducted during the 1976 fall semester. The following reflects significant information from this study.

Population

The tests were written especially for freshman Mexican-Americans who have Spanish speaking backgrounds, and live in the Southwest. They may be further defined as first semester Mexican-American freshmen registered for seven or more units.

Sample

During the period of the third through the fifth week of the fall semester 1976-1977, the two tests were administered to a sample of 804 first semester Mexican-American (self-identified) students in five of the six Border Consortium Colleges. The number of students taking the tests from the Border Community College Consortium are listed below:

Texas Southmost College	90
Laredo Junior College	267
Arizona Western College	48
Imperial Valley College	225
Southwestern College	174

These students were selected in two ways. In those schools having populations (as defined above) numbering less than 500, all the students in the population were invited to take the tests. In colleges with populations over 500 students, 500 students were randomly selected from each college and invited to take the tests. The proportions of respondents ranged from a high of 65% in one school to a low of 20% in another. The overall rate of response was approximately 40%. The wide range of responses can be primarily attributed to the fact that, although the Border Consortium Colleges share many common characteristics, there are wide differences in institutional philosophies. Most of the Border Consortium Colleges have an open door policy but at least one has a policy of selective admissions. The college with the lowest response rate had no-testing policy, whereby a student is not required to take any tests whatsoever. Therefore, one could question whether this was a truly random sample. However, it should be recognized that under the present operating conditions of the Border Consortium Colleges, that it would be impossible to administer the tests to a truly random sample of adequate size (4:4-5).

Imperial Valley College's research specialist, Dr. Demetrius Karanthanos, made a comparison of the students, who took the tests to those who did not, at Imperial Valley College. The results are shown on Table 5.

Dr. Karanthanos's conclusions on the comparison are as follows:

1) Students who took the test appear to have a better achievement record as evident by the higher overall GPA and the GPA in English courses.

2) Students who took the test appear to have a better persistence record as evident by the higher percentage of units completed, and by the lower percentage of complete withdrawals.

Although the results of Table 5 apply only to Imperial Valley College, similar differences between the two groups would be expected to be found for the other schools as well. It is important when one is interpreting scores on these tests, that the conclusions given in the comparison of students who respondently taking the tests and those who did not respond be kept in mind (4:6).

Score Interpretation

Percentile ranks and percentile bands were used in interpreting raw scores. The percentile rank corresponds to a raw score indicating the percent of students in the sample who scored lower than the raw score indicated. Percentile bands help interpret raw scores by giving a finer and truer assessment of what student's competence in the area covered by the test. The percentile band attempts to give a normal distribution about a particular point. The mean of this distribution corresponds to his or her theoretical true score. Since it is not practical for a student to take a test more than once in order to control extraneous factors (fatigue, room conditions, practice, etc.) his or her scores would not be identical each time even if he or she did take the tests more than one time. Therefore, one can approximate this normal distribution about a particular point statistically and the result is a percentile band (4:6-7).

Precision of Norms

Dr. Karanthanos set up norms for eight portions of the two tests. These are given in Tables 6 through 16.

The precision of the reported percentile ranks for the two tests depends primarily on the size of the standard error of measurement of the test. This error of measurement is a direct function of the reliability coefficient and provides an indication of how representative the items used on the test are of the total possible items in the area covered by the test. Since the standard error of measurement is used in constructing the percentile bands, these bands account for the error due to the sampling of items (4:8).

Table 15 shows mean and standard deviations for 39 and reliability coefficients for 20 portions of the two tests. Table 16 shows the relative performance on 20 portions of the tests for men and women. Differences between men and women are small (4:8).

Reliability

The reliability coefficients reported on these tests are internal consistency measures and were computed by the Kunder-Richardson Formula 20. The coefficients for 20 portions of the test are shown on Table 15 (4:8).

Validity

A. Descriptive Test of English Skills (DTES).

The Descriptive Test of English Skills (DTES) was primarily designed to be used as 1) a diagnostic instrument, and 2) a placement tool. No formal studies have been conducted to access the diagnostic utility of the DTES. However, informal observations of teachers of English as a second language who have used the DTES indicate that the test is a useful diagnostic tool. Similarly, no generalized formal studies have been conducted to assess the placement efficiency of the DTES. Because of differences in course content in various English programs, placement studies cannot be generalized, but must be conducted at each individual school using the test. There are several indications which are encouraging regarding the placement utility of the DTES:

1. The fairly high standard deviations reported on Table 14 indicate the tests provide good discrimination among the target students;
2. The correlations shown on Table 17 between the Border Consortium tests and other standardized English tests range from .54 to .73. These moderate correlations are of a desirable magnitude as they are high enough to indicate that all of the tests measure similar skills (English), but they are not high enough to make the tests interchangeable;
3. Table 18 shows correlations between grades in specific English courses and scores on various portions of the DTES. English 01 is a general skills course designed to bring a student's skills to the level required for the standard English composition course. English 21 is the typical English composition course. (4: 17-18)

B. Verbal Aptitude Test

Table 19 shows intercorrelations among the three distinct parts of the Verbal Aptitude Test - English, Bilingual Mode, and Spanish. The low correlation of .23 between English and Spanish points to the obvious fact that high aptitude in one language does not necessarily mean high aptitude in the other. The moderate correlations of the Bilingual Mode with English and Spanish (.64 and .62, respectively) seem reasonable since the Bilingual Mode is mixture of the two languages. Table 20 provides correlations between various parts of the Verbal Aptitude Test and three performance variables: 1) first semester overall GPA, 2) first semester GPA in English, and 3) grade in Spanish 41 (an elementary Spanish course) (4: 19)

VI. UTILIZATION OF THE BORDER COMMUNITY COLLEGE CONSORTIUM TESTS

The utilization factor is the most important function of the Border Consortium tests.

Descriptive Test of English Skills

The questions of the Descriptive Test of English Skills, (DTES) assess strengths and weaknesses that Mexican-American students may have in writing, reading, and listening to English as used in college classrooms. The test is not designed to survey all the English skills needed to complete a regular freshman composition course; instruments already exist to test such skills. Nor is the test intended for students who speak only Spanish or are just beginning to receive instruction in English as a second language (2:3).

The DTES can be used as a diagnostic instrument by observing the following procedure. Questions are placed in a list only once according to the primary problem being tested (see table 21). Information is then transferred from the answer sheets to a grid (see table 22) by utilizing scoring stencils that color code the various groups of errors (Table 23 combines the problem types and the grid). The English instructor would then prescribe exercises to remedy those deficiencies that were diagnosed. Formal studies have to be conducted to assess the diagnostic utility of the DTES.

Similarly, formal studies have to be conducted to assess the placement efficiency of the DTES. These studies must be conducted in each college primarily because of the differences in course content in the various English programs. The DTES offers good possibilities for successful placement of Mexican-American students in the various English courses.

Verbal Aptitude Test

Because a verbal aptitude is designed to measure developed verbal ability, it reflects such factors as exposure to a language and oppor-

tunities for learning. If someone has had little experience in using English, for example, a test of verbal skills in English cannot measure that person's verbal aptitude accurately. Since many Mexican-American students have been exposed to Spanish as well as English, a test measuring the developed verbal ability of these students in both languages can be useful (2:9).

The Verbal Aptitude Test is designed to give guidance and placement information to students of Spanish-speaking backgrounds and to their counselors. In planning a student's program, it is important to have an indication of the student's verbal skills in comparison with those of other students and to know in which language the student's present strength lies. Other indicators of verbal aptitude, such as an extended interview, would, of course, be useful for some people. However, the test provides a significant standard measure of developed verbal ability in English, Spanish, and a bilingual mode. Table 24 shows a grid that can be utilized in listing percentages or percentiles in order to properly assess the student's language strengths (2:9).

Formal studies have to be conducted in each school to assess intercorrelations among the three distinct parts of the Verbal Aptitude Test and performance varibles that could be used to reasonably predict college success. Table 20 shows correlations that were not very significant at Imperial Valley College but investigations should not be precluded because of this.

VII. CONCLUSION

The Border Community College Consortium Testing Program for Bilingual (Spanish/English) Students was developed by counselors, teachers, and students from six community or junior colleges in Texas, Arizona and California.

The following people participated in the development of the tests:

COMMITTEE OF EXAMINERS
FOR THE DESCRIPTIVE TEST
OF ENGLISH SKILLS

Stella Dickenson
Southwestern Community College

John Galvan
Texas Southmost College

Marjorie Holiman
Cochise College

Gonzalo Huerta
Arizona Western College

Arthur Innis
Laredo Community College

William Miller
Cochise College

Alicia Perez
Laredo Junior College

with the assistance
of Michael H. Ward
Educational Testing Service

COMMITTEE OF EXAMINERS
FOR THE VERBAL
APTITUDE TEST

Mario Beltran
Arizona Western College

Moses Camarena
Arizona Western College

Luis Garcia
Cochise College

Hector L. Lopez
Imperial Valley College

J.J. Martinez
Texas Southmost College

Vicente Molina
Laredo Junior College

Carmen Casillas Scott
Imperial Valley College

Bertha Trevino
Laredo Junior College

with the assistnace
of Linda Conrad
Educational Testing Service

The Border Community College Consortium Testing Program for Bilingual Students could not have been developed without the help of many besides those on the committees of examiners. Among those individuals who were invaluable to the project were:

George A. Schlekat, former project director at ETS; Albert Beistero, former Director of the Border Community College Consortium, now President of Texas Southmost College; Dr. Domingo Arechiga, former Acting Director of the consortium now President of Laredo Junior College; Dr. Terrel Spencer, former President of Imperial Valley College; Dean Leptich, Dean of Student Services at Imperial

Valley College; Dr. Demetrius Karanthanos, Research Specialist at Imperial Valley College, now evening counselor at Palomar Community College; and Reuben Lopez, former head of Federal Projects Arizona Western College, now Dean of the Imperial Valley College External Campus

Other students, faculty members, and counselors who participated in the test development discussions or work were:

Lucia Elias - Olivares; Dr. Josephine Sobrino; Albert Cardenas; Rudi Castillo; Tony Hernandez; Ignacio Ibarra; Berta Alicia Montoya; Myrna Villa; Vicente Villalvazo; Gilberto Villarreal, and many others whose help is here gratefully acknowledged. Also essential to the project were the expertise and support of a number of staff of Educational Testing Service.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Books and/or Periodicals

1. American College Testing Program. Assessing Students on the Way to College, Volume II, College Student Profiles: Norms for the ACT Assessment. Iowa City, Iowa: The American College Testing Program, 1972.

2. Border Community College Consortium Testing Program for Bilingual Students, Guide for Teachers and Counselors, Border College Consortium, Inc., 1975.

B. College and Consortium Publications and Unpublished Works

3. Minutes of the Border Junior College Consortium Test Development Workshop, Douglas, Arizona, May 18, 1971. (Mimeographed)

4. Karanthanos, Demetrius, "Descriptive Test of English Skills and Verbal Aptitude Test," Imperial Valley College, Imperial, California, 1978. (Mimeographed)

5. Minutes of the Border Junior College Consortium Test Development Workshop, Tempe, Arizona, July 8-9, 1971. (Mimeographed)

6. Grant Application for Strengthening Developing Institutions: Imperial Valley College, 1973-74. Border Consortium, 1972. (Mimeographed)

7. Grant Application for Strengthening Developing Institutions: Laredo Junior College, 1973-74. Border Consortium, 1971. (Mimeographed)

8. Grant Application for Strengthening Developing Institutions: Southwestern College, 1973-74. Border Consortium, 1972. (Mimeographed)

9. Grant Application for Strengthening Developing Institutions: Arizona Western College, 1973-74. Border Consortium, 1972. (Mimeographed)

10. Grant Application for Strengthening Developing Institutions: Cochise College, 1973-74. Border Consortium, 1972. (Mimeographed)

11. Schlekat, G.A. (Project Coordinator, Educational Testing Service) Letter to Mr. Albert A. Besteiro, Executive Director, Border Junior College Consortium, dated 12, 1972.

12. _____. "Proposal for Developmental Funds for Aptitude and Diagnostic Tests, Staff Instructional Materials and Institutional Research Programs for the Benefit of Chicano College Students." Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1973. (Mimeographed)

APPENDIX

Table 1

Correlation Between ACT Scores and College Grades Earned by Mexican American Students Enrolled at Four Border Consortium Colleges

College	N	Academic Year	American College Testing Program Scores				
			English	Mathematics	Social Studies	Natural Sciences	Composite
Cochise College	56	1972-73	.08	.16	.15	.10	.15
Laredo Junior College	205	1971-72	.12	.20	.19	.24	.21
Southwestern College	139	1970-71	.14	.23	.21	.25	.26
Texas Southmost College	138	1971-72	.26	.31	.18	.25	.28

Source: American College Testing Program Standard Research Service Report prepared for each institution for the academic year of data.

Table 2

Comparison of ACT Scores for Freshmen Enrolled at Laredo Junior College, Texas Southmost College, and a National Sample of 425 Colleges During Academic Year 1971-72

ACT Test	Texas Southmost College (N = 346) Mean	S.D.	Laredo Junior College (N = 242) Mean	S.D.	National Sample (N = 307,489) Mean	S.D.
English	12.7	5.3	13.0	5.2	18.9	4.9
Mathematics	12.9	5.1	12.9	5.3	19.6	6.8
Social Studies	11.6	6.4	11.1	6.4	20.3	6.3
Natural Sciences	14.2	5.1	14.8	4.9	20.8	6.2
Composite	12.9	4.4	13.1	4.2	20.0	5.0

Source: American College Testing Program Standard Research Service Report prepared for each institution for the academic year of data.

Table 3

Comparison of ACT Scores for Low Income[a] Mexican American and Caucasian Students as Reported for the 1970-71 Norms

ACT Test	Mexican American Students (N = 3,760) Mean	S.D.	Caucasian Students (N = 83,850) Mean	S.D.
English	14.2	5.4	17.9	5.1
Mathematics	15.1	5.8	19.0	6.4
Social Studies	15.5	6.8	19.0	6.8
Natural Sciences	16.1	5.4	20.3	6.0
Composite	15.3	4.8	19.2	5.1

Source: Assessing Students on the Way to College: Volume II -- College Student Profiles: Norms for the ACT Assessment issued to each member institution.

[a]The low income figure of under $7,500 was determined by using the 1967 U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics published low-income budget figure and adjusting for inflation since that time.

Table 4

DESCRIPTIVE TEST OF ENGLISH SKILLS

Section I	Writing Ability Part A Sentence Completion Part B Usage
Section II	Vocabulary Part A Single Words Part B Words and Phrases in context
Section III	Reading and Listneing in English Part A Reading Part B Listening

VERBAL APTITUDE TEST

Section IV	Listening & Reading in a Bilingual Mode Part A Listening Part B Reading
Section V	Listening and Reading in Spanish Part A Listening Part B Reading

Table 5

STUDENTS WHO TOOK THE TEST				
1st Semester Overall GPA	1st Semester GPA in English	Percentage Completing 7 or more Units	Average Number of Units Completed	Percentage who Withdrew Completely
X = 2.315 S = .714 N = 194	X = 2.448 S = .924 N = 112	80%	X = 12.30 S = 4.50 N = 201	9%
STUDENTS WHO DID NOT TAKE THE TEST				
X = 2.174 S = .846 N = 84	X = 2.270 S = .882 N = 36	49%	X = 10.39 S = 5.19 N = 94	27%

TABLE 6

INDIVIDUAL SCORE NORMS
DESCRIPTIVE TEST OF ENGLISH SKILLS, N=804

NUMBER RIGHT	%TILE RANK	%TILE BAND	NUMBER RIGHT	%TILE RANK	%TILE BAND	NUMBER RIGHT	%TILE RANK	%TILE BAND
175	99+	99+	129	63	54-70	83	16	14-19
174	99+	99-99+	128	62	53-69	82	16	14-18
173	99+	99-99+	127	61	51-67	81	15	13-18
172	99+	98-99+	126	60	50-66	80	15	13-17
171	99+	98-99+	125	58	49-65	79	14	12-16
170	99+	97-99+	124	56	48-64	78	14	12-16
169	99+	96-99+	123	54	47-62	77	13	11-16
168	99+	96-99+	122	53	46-61	76	13	11-16
167	99	95-99+	121	51	45-60	75	12	11-16
166	99	95-99+	120	50	43-58	74	12	10-15
165	98	94-99+	119	49	42-56	73	11	10-15
164	97	93-99+	118	48	42-54	72	11	10-14
163	97	92-99	117	47	41-53	71	11	10-14
162	96	92-99	116	46	40-51	70	10	9-13
161	96	91-98	115	45	39-50	69	10	8-13
160	95	90-98	114	43	37-49	68	10	8-12
159	95	90-97	113	42	36-48	67	10	8-12
158	94	89-96	112	41	35-47	66	9	7-11
157	93	88-96	111	40	34-47	65	8	7-11
156	92	87-95	110	39	33-46	64	8	6-11
155	92	86-95	109	37	32-45	63	8	6-10
154	91	84-94	108	36	30-43	62	7	5-10
153	90	84-93	107	35	30-42	61	7	5-10
152	90	84-92	106	34	29-41	60	6	5-10
151	89	83-92	105	33	28-40	59	6	5- 9
150	88	82-91	104	32	27-39	58	5	4- 8
149	87	81-90	103	30	26-37	57	5	4- 8
148	86	80-90	102	30	25-36	56	5	4- 8
147	84	79-89	101	29	24-35	55	5	3- 7
146	84	78-88	100	28	23-34	54	4	3- 7
145	83	77-87	99	27	23-33	53	4	3- 6
144	82	75-87	98	26	22-32	52	4	3- 6
143	81	74-86	97	25	21-30	51	3	3- 5
142	80	73-84	96	24	20-30	50	3	3- 5
141	79	71-84	95	23	20-29	49	3	3- 5
140	78	70-83	94	23	19-28	48	3	2- 5
139	77	69-82	93	22	18-27	47	3	2- 4
138	75	67-81	92	21	18-26	46	3	2- 4
137	74	66-80	91	20	17-25	45	2	2- 4
136	73	65-79	90	20	16-24	44	2	2- 4
135	71	64-78	89	19	16-23	43	2	2- 3
134	70	62-77	88	18	16-23	42	2	2- 3
133	69	61-75	87	18	16-22	41	2	2- 3
132	68	60-74	86	17	15-21	40	2	2- 3
131	66	58-73	85	16	15-20	39	2	1- 3
130	65	56-71	84	16	15-20	38	2	1- 3

TABLE 6
(Continued)

NUMBER RIGHT	%TILE RANK	%TILE BAND	NUMBER RIGHT	%TILE RANK	%TILE BAND	NUMBER RIGHT	%TILE RANK	%TILE BAND
37	2	1 - 2	34	1	1 - 2	31	1	1 - 2
36	1	1 - 2	33	1	1 - 2	30	1	1 - 2
35	1	1 - 2	32	1	1 - 2	1-29	1	1 - 2

TABLE 7

INDIVIDUAL SCORE NORMS
VOCABULARY - ENGLISH, N=804

NUMBER RIGHT	%TILE RANK	%TILE BAND	NUMBER RIGHT	%TILE RANK	%TILE BAND	NUMBER RIGHT	%TILE RANK	%TILE BAND
60	99+	95-99+	42	60	48-72	25	13	10-19
59	99	94-99+	41	56	44-68	24	12	9-17
58	99	92-99+	40	52	40-64	23	10	8-15
57	98	90-99+	39	48	36-60	22	9	7-14
56	97	90-99+	38	44	33-56	21	8	6-13
55	95	89-98	37	40	31-52	20	7	5-13
54	94	86-97	36	36	28-48	19	6	4-12
53	92	84-95	35	33	26-44	18	5	4-10
52	90	82-94	34	31	23-40	17	4	3- 9
51	89	79-92	33	28	21-40	16	3	3- 8
50	86	76-90	32	26	19-36	15	3	2- 7
49	84	72-89	31	23	19-33	14	2	2- 6
48	82	68-86	30	21	17-31	13	2	1- 5
47	79	64-84	29	19	15-28	12	1	1- 4
46	76	60-82	28	17	14-26	11	1	1- 3
45	72	56-82	27	15	13-23	10	1	1- 3
44	68	52-79	26	14	12-21	1- 9	1	1- 2
43	64	52-76						

TABLE 8

INDIVIDUAL SCORE NORMS
WRITING ABILITY - ENGLISH, N=804

NUMBER RIGHT	%TILE RANK	%TILE BAND	NUMBER RIGHT	%TILE RANK	%TILE BAND	NUMBER RIGHT	%TILE RANK	%TILE BAND
65	99+	90-99+	45	36	30-43	26	10	8-13
64	98	87-99+	44	34	28-40	25	9	7-12
63	96	83-99+	43	32	26-38	24	8	7-11
62	93	80-98	42	30	24-36	23	7	6-11
61	90	76-96	41	28	23-34	22	7	6-10
60	87	71-83	40	26	21-32	21	6	5- 9
59	83	67-90	39	24	19-30	20	6	4- 8
58	80	67-87	38	23	19-28	19	5	3- 7
57	76	63-83	37	21	18-26	18	4	3- 7
56	71	60-80	36	19	16-24	17	3	3- 6
55	67	56-80	35	18	16-24	16	3	3- 6
54	63	53-76	34	16	15-23	15	3	2- 6
53	59	49-71	33	16	14-21	14	2	2- 5
52	56	47-67	32	15	13-19	13	2	1- 4
51	53	43-63	31	14	12-18	12	1	1- 3
50	49	40-60	30	13	11-16	11	1	1- 3
49	47	38-56	29	12	11-16	10	1	1- 3
48	43	36-53	28	11	10-15	9	1-	1- 2
47	40	34-49	27	11	9-14	1- 8	1-	1- 2
46	38	32-47						

TABLE 9

INDIVIDUAL SCORE NORMS
READING - ENGLISH, N=804

NUMBER RIGHT	%TILE RANK	%TILE BAND	NUMBER RIGHT	%TILE RANK	%TILE BAND	NUMBER RIGHT	%TILE RANK	%TILE BAND
40	99+	94-99+	27	66	51-75	14	12	9-24
39	99	91-99+	26	60	46-71	13	9	7-21
38	98	88-99	25	55	41-71	12	7	5-18
37	97	88-98	24	51	36-66	11	5	4-15
36	96	85-97	23	46	32-60	10	4	3-15
35	94	81-96	22	41	27-55	9	3	2-12
34	91	78-94	21	36	27-51	8	2	1- 9
33	88	75-94	20	32	24-46	7	1	1- 7
32	85	71-91	19	27	21-41	6	1	1- 5
31	81	66-88	18	24	18-36	5	1-	1- 4
30	78	60-85	17	21	15-36	4	1-	1- 3
29	75	60-81	16	18	12-32	3	1-	1- 2
28	71	55-78	15	15	9-27	1- 2	1-	1- 2

INDIVIDUAL SCORE NORMS
LISTENING - ENGLISH, N=804

NUMBER RIGHT	%TILE RANK	%TILE BAND	NUMBER RIGHT	%TILE RANK	%TILE BAND	NUMBER RIGHT	%TILE RANK	%TILE BAND
40	99+	93-99+	27	59	47-69	14	10	8-22
39	99+	93-99+	26	55	43-64	13	8	6-20
38	99	90-99+	25	50	39-64	12	6	5-17
37	98	87-99	24	47	35-59	11	5	3-13
36	96	82-98	23	43	30-55	10	3	3-10
35	93	78-96	22	39	30-50	9	3	2- 8
34	90	74-93	21	35	25-47	8	2	1- 8
33	87	69-93	20	30	22-43	7	1	1- 6
32	82	64-90	19	25	20-39	6	1	1- 5
31	78	64-87	18	22	17-35	5	1	1- 3
30	74	59-82	17	20	13-35	4	1	1- 3
29	69	55-78	16	17	10-30	1- 3	1	1- 2
28	64	50-74	15	13	8-25			

TABLE 11

INDIVIDUAL SCORE NORMS
VERBAL APTITUDE IN ENGLISH, N=804

NUMBER RIGHT	%TILE RANK	%TILE BAND	NUMBER RIGHT	%TILE RANK	%TILE BAND	NUMBER RIGHT	%TILE RANK	%TILE BAND
80	99+	98-99+	57	71	62-77	34	18	13-28
79	99+	98-99+	56	69	59-75	33	16	12-26
78	99+	97-99+	55	67	57-72	32	15	11-24
77	99+	96-99+	54	65	54-71	31	13	10-22
76	99	94-99+	53	62	51-69	30	12	9-20
75	99	93-99+	52	59	50-69	29	11	9-18
74	98	91-99+	51	57	47-67	28	10	7-16
73	98	90-99+	50	54	44-65	27	9	6-15
72	97	90-98	49	51	41-62	26	7	5-13
71	96	89-98	48	50	39-59	25	6	4-12
70	94	87-97	47	47	37-57	24	5	4-11
69	93	85-96	46	44	35-54	23	4	3-11
68	91	83-94	45	41	33-51	22	4	3-10
67	90	81-93	44	39	31-50	21	3	3- 9
66	89	79-93	43	37	31-47	20	3	2- 7
65	87	77-91	42	35	28-44	19	2	1- 6
64	85	75-90	41	33	26-41	18	2	1- 5
63	83	72-89	40	31	24-39	17	1	1- 4
62	81	71-87	39	28	22-37	16	1	1- 3
61	79	69-85	38	26	20-37	15	1	1- 3
60	77	67-83	37	24	18-35	14	1	1- 3
59	75	65-81	36	22	16-33	13	1	1- 2
58	72	62-79	35	20	15-31	1-12	1	1- 2

TABLE 12

INDIVIDUAL SCORE NORMS
VERBAL APTITUDE IN THE BILINGUAL MODE, N=786

NUMBER RIGHT	%TILE RANK	%TILE BAND	NUMBER RIGHT	%TILE RANK	%TILE BAND	NUMBER RIGHT	%TILE RANK	%TILE BAND
40	98	96-98	28	68	53-78	17	13	7-33
39	98	94-98	27	64	48-73	16	9	4-27
38	98	91-98	26	59	44-68	15	7	4-22
37	98	88-98	25	53	39-68	14	4	3-17
36	97	83-98	24	48	33-64	13	3	2-13
35	96	83-97	23	44	27-59	12	2	1- 9
34	94	78-96	22	39	27-53	11	1	1- 9
33	91	73-94	21	33	22-48	10	1	1- 7
32	88	68-91	20	27	17-44	9	1-	1- 4
31	83	64-91	19	22	13-39	8	1-	1- 3
30	78	59-88	18	17	9-39	1- 7	1-	1- 2
29	73	53-83						

TABLE 13

INDIVIDUAL SCORE NORMS
VERBAL APTITUDE IN SPANISH, N=786

NUMBER RIGHT	%TILE RANK	%TILE BAND	NUMBER RIGHT	%TILE RANK	%TILE BAND	NUMBER RIGHT	%TILE RANK	%TILE BAND
60	99+	99-99+	42	72	59-80	24	20	13-28
59	99+	99-99+	41	69	56-77	23	17	13-26
58	99+	97-99+	40	66	53-74	22	15	11-23
57	99+	95-99+	39	63	50-72	21	13	10-21
56	99	93-99+	38	59	50-69	20	11	8-20
55	99	91-99+	37	56	47-66	19	10	7-17
54	98	90-99	36	53	44-63	18	8	5-15
53	97	88-99	35	50	41-59	17	7	4-13
52	95	88-98	34	47	37-56	16	5	3-11
51	93	86-97	33	44	34-53	15	4	2-11
50	91	83-95	32	41	31-50	14	3	2-10
49	90	80-93	31	37	28-47	13	2	1- 8
48	88	77-91	30	34	26-44	12	2	1- 7
47	86	74-90	29	31	23-44	11	1	1- 5
46	83	72-88	28	28	21-41	10	1	1- 4
45	80	70-86	27	26	20-37	9	1	1- 3
44	77	66-83	26	23	17-34	1- 8	1	1- 2
43	74	63-83	25	21	15-31			

x

TABLE 14

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS FOR VARIOUS SECTIONS AND SUBSECTIONS OF THE TESTS (TOTAL CONSORTIUM, N = 804)

DESCRIPTION OF SECTION OR SUBSECTION	NUMBER OF ITEMS	MEAN	STD. DEV.	REL. COEFF.
1. Descriptive Test of English Skills	175	115.1	31.1	.97
2. Section I - Writing Ability	65	46.9	13.1	.95
3. Part A (Section I) Sentence Completion	30	24.1	5.7	.90
4. Part B (Section I) Usage	35	22.8	8.1	.92
5. Verbs	13	9.6	3.2	NA
6. Pronouns	9	6.9	2.1	NA
7. Prepositions	10	7.1	2.0	NA
8. Adverbs	6	4.2	1.3	NA
9. Nouns	4	3.1	1.0	NA
10. Noun Predictors	5	4.3	1.0	NA
11. Minimal Pairs	2	0.9	0.8	NA
12. Plurals	3	1.9	1.1	NA
13. Comparatives	3	2.1	1.0	NA
14. Apostrophes	3	1.8	1.0	NA
15. Idioms	3	2.1	0.9	NA
16. Tag Questions	2	1.1	0.8	NA
17. Double Negatives	2	1.8	0.5	NA
18. Section II - Vocabulary	60	38.3	10.9	.92
19. Part A (Section II) - Single Words and Phrases	40	23.8	7.6	.88
20. Part B (Section II) Words and Phrases in Context	20	14.5	3.9	.81

TABLE 15
(Continued)

	DESCRIPTION OF SECTION OR SUBSECTION	NUMBER OF ITEMS	MEAN	STD. DEV.	REL. COEFF.
21.	Section III - Total Verbal Aptitude in English	80	47.9	14.4	.93
22.	Parts A & C (Section III) - Total Reading Score	40	23.6	7.6	.87
23.	Parts B & D (Section III) - Total Listening Score	40	24.2	7.7	.88
24.	Part A (Section III) Partial Reading Score	25	14.1	5.1	.82
25.	Main Idea	3	1.6	1.0	NA
26.	Explicit Detail	9	5.8	2.0	NA
27.	Implication	13	6.7	2.9	NA
28.	Part B (Section III) - Partial Listening Score	25	15.9	5.0	.82
29.	Main Idea	2	1.1	0.7	NA
30.	Explicit Detail	12	7.3	2.4	NA
31.	Implication	11	7.5	2.5	NA
32.	Part C (Section III) - Partial Reading Score	15	9.6	3.1	.74
33.	Part D (Section III) - Partial Listening Score	15	8.4	3.3	.77
34.	Section IV - Total Bilingual Mode Score	40	23.6	7.0	.85
35.	Part A (Section IV) - Bilingual Listening	25	14.6	4.0	.73
36.	Part B (Section IV) - Bilingual Reading	15	8.9	3.8	.83
37.	Section V - Total Spanish Score	60	33.8	12.1	.93
38.	Part A (Section V) Spanish Listening	30	16.7	5.8	.83
39.	Part B (Section V) Spanish Reading	30	17.1	6.9	.89

TABLE 16

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS ON SELECTED SECTIONS AND SUBSECTIONS FOR MALES (N=348) AND FEMALES (N=455) (TOTAL CONSORTIUM)

	DESCRIPTION OF SECTION OR SUBSECTION	MEAN		STD. DEVIATION	
		MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE
1.	Descriptive Test of English Skills	114.3	115.8	31.5	30.7
2.	Section I - Writing Ability	45.9	47.5	13.5	13.0
3.	Part A (Section I) Sentence Completion	23.7	24.3	5.9	5.5
4.	Part B (Section I) Usage	22.3	23.2	8.2	8.0
5.	Section II Vocabulary	38.0	38.5	11.0	10.9
6.	Part A (Section II) Single Words and Phrases	23.7	24.0	7.6	7.6
7.	Part B (Section II) Words and Phrases in Context	14.3	14.5	4.0	3.9
8.	Section III - Total Verbal Aptitude in English	47.8	47.9	14.6	14.5
9.	Parts A & C (Section III)-Total Reading Score	23.5	23.7	7.7	7.5
10.	Parts B & D (Section III)-Total Listening Score	24.3	24.2	7.6	7.8
11.	Part A (Section III)-Partial Reading Score	14.0	14.1	5.3	5.1
12.	Part B (Section III)-Partial Listening Score	15.7	15.4	5.3	5.3
13.	Part C (Section III)	9.5	9.6	3.2	3.0
14.	Part D (Section III)	8.3	8.5	3.3	3.4
15.	Section IV - Total Bilingual Mode Score	23.3	23.7	7.1	6.9
16.	Part A (Section IV) - Bilingual Listening	14.4	14.8	4.0	4.0
17.	Part B (Section IV) - Bilingual Reading	8.9	8.9	3.9	3.8
18.	Section V-Total Spanish Score	33.1	34.4	12.8	11.6
19.	Part A(Section V) Spanish Listening	16.4	16.9	6.0	5.7
20.	Part B (Section V) Spanish Reading	16.7	17.5	7.4	6.6

TABLE 17

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN BORDER COLLEGE TESTS
AND OTHER STANDARDIZED ENGLISH TESTS

	N	DTES	WRITING (DTES)	VOCAB (DTES)	READ-ING	LISTEN-ING	VERBAL APTITUDE
Nelson Denney Vocabulary	143			.67			
Nelson Denney Comprehension	143				.56	.46	
Nelson Denney Total	143	.67	.54				
College English Placement Test	143	.73	.64	.72	.69	.68	
ACT-English	200	.70	.65	.67	.65	.59	.65

TABLE 18

CORRELATIONS OF GRADES IN ENGLISH 01 AND ENGLISH 21
WITH SCORES ON PORTIONS OF THE DTES, (LAREDO COLLEGE)

	N	DTES								
		DTES (1)*	WRIT (2)	SENT (3)	USAGE (4)	VOCAB (5)	WF-S (6)	WF-C (7)	READ (8)	LIST (9)
English 01	130	.44	.41	.39	.38	.42	.42	.33	.41	.33
English 21	93	.47	.45	.44	.40	.46	.41	.44	.39	.30

*(1) Descriptive Test of English Skills, (2) Writing Ability (Section I); (3) Sentence Completion (Part A-Section I); (4) Usage (Part B-Section I), (5) Vocabulary (Section II), (6) Single Words and Phrases (Part A-Section II); (7) Words and Phrases in Context (Part B-Section II); (8) Reading (Parts A & C-Section III); (9) Listening (Parts B & D-Section III)

TABLE 19

INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG THE THREE PARTS OF THE VERBAL APTITUDE TEST, N=786

	English	Bilingual	Spanish
English			
Bilingual	.64		
Spanish	.23	.62	

TABLE 20

CORRELATIONS OF 1) FIRST SEMESTER OVERALL GPA, 2) FIRST SEMESTER ENGLISH GPA, 3) GRADE IN SPANISH 41 WITH VARIOUS PARTS OF THE VERBAL APTITUDE TEST

	First Semester College GPA (N=651)	First Semester English GPA (N=366)	Grade In Spanish 41 (N=81)
English Aptitude	.28	.30	
English Reading	.30	.31	
English Listening	.22	.24	
Bilingual Aptitude	.26	.26	.44
Bilingual Reading	.29	.31	.46
Bilingual Listening	.18	.16	.33
Spanish Aptitude	.18		.55
Spanish Reading	.15		.48
Spanish Listening	.15		.57

MAR 1980
ERIC/CRESS
RECEIVED

TABLE 21

Section 1 Problem Types
(Part A, 1-30; Part B, 31-65)

Questions may test more than one problem. However, each question is placed in the following list only once, according to the primary problem tested.

VERBS:

tense and agreement-15,21,23,27,33,44
form-38,48,53,58
auxiliary-24,50
conditional-39

PRONOUNS:

number and gender agreement-9,16,42,46
case-11,52
form-20,35,49

PREPOSITIONS:

with phrases and idioms-3,10,12,34,36,62
with verbals-7,17
as connectors-61,64

ADVERBS*:

adjective-adverb confusion-1,59,65
as connectors-8,40
logical use-22

NOUNS*:

count nouns-13,18
adjective-noun agreement-14,54

NOUN PREDICTORS: 4,6,32,37,51

MINIMAL PAIRS: 60,63

PLURALS: 43,47,56

COMPARATIVES: 19,28,57

APOSTROPHES: 26,30,45

IDIOMS: 5,41,55

TAG QUESTIONS: 25,29

DOUBLE NEGATIVES: 2,31

*Also includes adjective problems

MAR 1980
ERIC/CRESS
RECEIVED

TABLE 22

Section 1 Grid*

STUDENTS' NAMES	Verbs (13)	Pronouns (9)	Prepositions (10)	Adverbs (6)	Nouns (4)	Noun Predictors (5)	Minimal Pairs (2)	Plurals (3)	Comparatives (3)	Apostrophes (3)	Idioms (3)	Tag Questions (2)	Double Negatives (2)
	NUMBER CORRECT												

*To facilitate the transfer of information from the students' answer sheets to the grid, each school in the Border Community College Consortium has been provided with scoring stencils that color-code the various groups of errors.

MAR 1980
ERIC/CRESS
RECEIVED

TABLE 23

Section III Problem Types
(Part A, 126-150; Part B, 151-175)

Part A-Reading	Part B-Listening
Main Idea: 141, 144, 147	Main Idea: 163, 169
Explicit Detail: 126, 130, 131, 136, 137, 138, 139, 142, 146	Explicit Detail: 151, 152, 155, 156, 160, 161, 162, 165, 166, 167, 170, 172
Implication: 127, 128, 129, 132, 133, 134, 135, 140, 143, 145, 148, 149, 150	Implication: 153, 154, 157, 158, 159, 164 168, 171, 173, 174, 175

MAR 1980
ERIC/CRESS
RECEIVED

TABLE 24

Section III Grid*

	PART A READING			PART B LISTENING		
	Main Idea (3)	Explicit Detail (9)	Implication (13)	Main Idea (2)	Explicit Detail (12)	Implication (11)
Students' Names	Number Correct					

*To facilitate the transfer of information from the students' answer sheets to the grid, each school in the Border Community College Consortium has been provided with scoring stencils that color-code the various groups of errors.

MAR 1980
ERIC/CRESS
RECEIVED

TABLE 25

Verbal Aptitude Test Grid

Students' Names	English Reading III, A & C	English Listening III, B & D	Total English Verbal Aptitude III	Bilingual Listening IV, A	Bilingual Reading IV, B	Total Bilingual Verbal Aptitude IV	Spanish Listening V, A	Spanish Reading V, B	Total Spanish Verbal Aptitude V
	Percentage Correct								

English, bilingual, and Spanish scores should not be combined.